

JUN 07 2001

KALYNDA TILGES: Kalynda Tilges, Citizen Alert. First of all, I'd like to thank the Department of Energy for having at least one hearing out of three in a community center and not in a casino to allow us to bring our children and feel comfortable, and those of us who have severe allergies to tobacco smoke to come and be comfortable. Thank you. This should be done more often.

Also everyone here, please comment. I don't care if you think -- I'm going to say right up front I'm with Citizen Alert. I'm totally biased against this project. But I don't care if you all think this is the greatest thing since sliced bread. If you want to say -- come on down here and do this. Everyone needs to make a comment on this. Let's give these people a lot of work, a lot of things to think about. Please get up and say something about it, even if you're in favor of it.

1 Okay. Now, formal stuff here. Once again I'm going to say it again. The hearings are too limited. This is a national issue. We need national hearings all over the country, not just in Pahrump, Amargosa and Las Vegas. And even if they were just held in Nevada they need to be held in Caliente. They need to be in Tonopah, Goldfield, Boulder City, Henderson, everywhere. These people care about this issue.

Second thing, I am formally requesting an extension of the SDEIS. This is the document we're here to comment on it, comment on tonight (indicating). But when you get this you realize that this document is referencing this document (indicating), and you have to order that separately.

Then you also find out that it's referencing the entire DEIS, and there is no way. I'm sorry, I don't think any of your technical people can research all of this, reference everything, think about it and comment on it in 45 days. So with that said I'm going to put this thing to good use.

2 Again I'm also really concerned. The Final EIS has to come out before the Site Recommendation. We need responses to the over 11,000 comments that were on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement alone. We want to know that our concerns were listened to, they were considered and they were heard. And I'm formally requesting that that happen.

3... In this document from what I've seen so far very important errors could have been corrected in the Supplement but were not, such as there's a green piece of paper back on the Citizen Alert table back there, a brand new article that apparently the NRC just randomly took 20 figures out of the Department of Energy's calculations and found out that oh, ten were wrong, including the 120 millirem doses at 550,000 years, right in the middle of the calculations errors in the NRC that they picked out. What else is wrong? This is just a random picking. The Department of Energy should withdraw this entire monstrosity. When you all know

3 cont. what you're doing, start again. We deserve better. And I think the Department is actually capable of better on that. |

4 | The accident scenarios ignore the addition of the huge storage pool, the Waste Handling Building, the design -- excuse me, the design basis accident used is the seismic collapse of the building, of the Waste Handling Building. But the pool itself as a risk is ignored completely. If the building collapses on a major seismic event, the pool is going to collapse too. The pumps are going to run dry. You're going to lose the water. There may be a criticality. That may be your significant event. So the accident scenario should include the consequence of damaging all the fuel in the pool as well, as well as water borne contamination. |

5 And leading on to that, | the Department of Energy cannot use water it doesn't have. The Supplement should not assume the repository water will come from appropriated water from the state because water will not be available unless the state engineer is overturned on appeal. The Supplement should look at alternative water sources and evaluate the impacts of these alternatives.

And, you know, I'm not going to go into detail. We'll just say resorting, that's never been done before. One tiny error in calculation could really screw the whole thing up. This is a very delicate operation, and this isn't even addressed at all. There's no mention of possible impacts if there's a mistake in oh, record keeping. Now, who would imagine that ever happening, huh? So we need to go back. Incorrect temperatures from waste blending can occur. We don't know what could happen. That isn't addressed either. |

And, please, once again, everybody get up, make a comment. Tell us how you feel. Your voices need to be heard. Thank you.